

(b)(6)

**U.S. Department of Homeland Security**  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



**U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services**

DATE: **JUN 10 2013**

OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]  
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Member of the Professions Holding an Advanced Degree or an Alien of Exceptional Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[REDACTED]

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ron Rosenberg".

Ron Rosenberg  
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, Texas Service Center denied the Form I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker. The petitioner appealed the decision to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The appeal will be sustained and the petition will be approved.

The petitioner seeks to permanently employ the beneficiary in the United States as a program director. The petitioner requests classification of the beneficiary as an advanced degree professional pursuant to section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2).<sup>1</sup>

As required by statute,<sup>2</sup> the petition is accompanied by an ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent Employment Certification (labor certification), certified by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL). The priority date of the petition is August 2, 2011.<sup>3</sup>

The director's decision denying the petition concluded that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary possessed the experience required by the terms of the labor certification.<sup>4</sup>

The record shows that the appeal is properly filed and makes a specific allegation of error in law or fact. The procedural history in this case is documented by the record and incorporated into the decision. Further elaboration of the procedural history will be made only as necessary.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d at 145. The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal.<sup>5</sup>

The petitioner submitted employment experience letters with the petition in order to establish that the beneficiary possessed the five years of experience required by the terms of the labor certification. The director disregarded the employment experience letters because they did not appear to be from the beneficiary's former employers.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 203(b)(2) of the Act provides immigrant classification to members of the professions holding advanced degrees or aliens of exceptional ability, whose services are sought by an employer in the United States.

<sup>2</sup> *See* section 212(a)(5)(D) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(5)(D); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(a)(2).

<sup>3</sup> The priority date is the date the DOL accepted the labor certification for processing. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d).

<sup>4</sup> The petitioner must establish that the beneficiary possessed all of the education, training, and experience specified on the labor certification as of the petition's priority date. *See Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977).

<sup>5</sup> The submission of additional evidence on appeal is allowed by the instructions to Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, which are incorporated into the regulations by 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(1). The record in the instant case provides no reason to preclude consideration of any of the documents newly submitted on appeal. *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988).

<sup>6</sup> The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(1) states, in part:

On appeal, the petitioner submitted additional evidence that addressed the issues discussed in the director's decision. This evidence established by a preponderance of the evidence that the beneficiary possessed the required experience set forth on the labor certification by the priority date. Thus, the director's decision will be withdrawn.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has met that burden.

**ORDER:** The appeal is sustained, and the petition is approved.

---

Evidence relating to qualifying experience or training shall be in the form of letter(s) from current or former employer(s) or trainer(s) and shall include the name, address, and title of the writer, and a specific description of the duties performed by the alien or of the training received. If such evidence is unavailable, other documentation relating to the alien's experience or training will be considered.